

### REMARKS

This response is the action mailed in the above-referenced case on 04/01/2005. In that action claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 14-16 are rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Further, claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over Norris USP 5805587, hereinafter Norris.

After a careful review of Norris, the standing claims, and the Examiner's statements and reasoning, the applicant has herein canceled all of the standing claims and added eight new claims 18-25 for examination. Of the added claims 18, 20, 22 and 24 are independent claims each incorporating at least one feature not taught or suggested in Norris, rendering these new claims patentable over Norris, and the depended claims patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Accordingly the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Yuri Shtivelman et al.

by 

Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457